

## FAX MEMO

**To:** Tom Clark  
Jim Waldo  
Tom Hurlbutt  
Lester Snow  
Cliff Schulz  
Chuck Hanson  
Steve Macaulay

**From:** Dave Schuster

**Date:** August 13, 1998

### Comments:

I have reviewed the CALFED August 3, 1998 draft "Developing a Draft Preferred Program Alternative" paper carefully. Although I still get frustrated with the fact no decision is going to be made now on the dual conveyance alternative, this draft is significantly better than earlier drafts. If one agrees with the political judgement that the dual conveyance alternative cannot be selected now but must wait an EPA decision on drinking water quality standards and it is proved that the Thru-Delta Alternative will not provide the desired fishery protections, then I have surprisingly few comments. The specific comments I do have follow.

Page 8: The discussion on the need for the dual conveyance alternative has some good statements such as: "The dual Delta conveyance with an isolated facility would significantly improve water quality for Delta exports and would lessen water diversion effects on most fish species. However, CALFED would have to work out assurances for its proper use and other protections for in-Delta needs." I agree with both statements. I do not like, however, the tone of the following two sentences: "At this time, CALFED cannot rule out the potential need for a need for a dual conveyance facility to achieve its mission. Neither can it conclude, based upon current information, that the facility is necessary for fulfilling that mission." I would strike these two sentences and add the following statement which I believe more accurately reflects the decision being made by CALFED: "The dual conveyance alternative is controversial and at this time, CALFED cannot prove that the through Delta conveyance alternative will not fulfill its mission."

Page 9: I disagree strongly with the following sentence: "CALFED believes more efficient use must be made of existing water supplies system-wide prior to building new surface storage." There is no connection. Storage, if built, would provide environmental water, which is not connected to water use, and for water supply. The water supply benefit must be paid for by the

*No -  
don't make  
this change -  
decision will be  
based on  
scientific  
judgment.*

Page 2

water users participating in the new storage facility will have to pay the cost of that facility which will be very high. No water user will participate in a storage project if water conservation measures are available that are cheaper than the storage facility costs. The second sentence is also wrong which is: "In addition, there must be enhanced opportunities for water transfers prior to building new storage." Why? No user will participate in a storage project if water transfers are available which would be significantly cheaper than the storage facility costs.

Page 28: I found it interesting that CALFED is proposing to buy 100,000 AF at up to \$200 per AF for the environment in Stage 1. That means CALFED would be a significant competitor with the water users especially during dry years. Do we want to force CALFED to balance water transfer purchases between the water users and the environment?

Page 33: The intertie between the DMC and the California Aqueduct (#4) should be dropped since it provides no benefits with south Delta channel enlargements, additional Clifton Court intake, and modified operating agreement (#2).

Page 33: The proposal to study the recirculation idea (#8) seems silly to me. We know there is insufficient capacity to implement this idea. This is probably in the document to get politicians off Snow's back. Should we ask them to state that the evaluation must assume that there can be no negative impact on CVP or SWP supplies?

Page 33: In the North Delta Improvements discussion they ignore the need for Sacramento County flood control improvements which involves enlarging the South Fork Mokelumne channel.

Page 33: My primary concern is this document is the proposal to construct three new fish screens. Why? Screens are expensive. My concern goes away if we don't have to pay for the screens. If we do have to pay all or a portion of the screen costs, then why isn't the Tracy P.P. screen sufficient? The primary purpose of building a screen during Stage 1 is to test to see if an efficient screen at Hood can be developed and constructed. A new screen is going to be built at Tracy P.P. If that screen is to be the same type as the Hood screen design, then the proposed test screen at Hood and new screen at Clifton Court are not needed. If the Tracy P.P. screen is not planned to be the same type as planned for Hood, then we should only build one additional screen either at Clifton Court or Hood not both. This is one issue that I believe technical discussions between Hanson and I with CALFED staff would be helpful. Please give me your thoughts on how I should pursue that thought. Who should I contact for example.

I will be on vacation next week.

Number of pages: 2